

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 \*\*\*

4  
5 MARY VAZQUEZ,

6 Plaintiff,

7 vs.

8 DAVID SEFCIK, *et al.*,

9 Defendants.

2:18-cv-00400-APG-VCF

**ORDER**

10  
11 Before the Court is the proposed Joint Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (ECF No. 11).

12 Pursuant to LR 26-1(a), “[i]f the plan sets deadlines within those specified in LR 26-1(b), the plan  
13 must state on its face in bold type, ‘SUBMITTED IN COMPLIANCE WITH LR 26-1(b).’ If longer  
14 deadlines are proposed, the plan must state on its face ‘SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW  
15 REQUESTED.’ Plans requesting special scheduling review must include, in addition to the information  
16 required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) and LR 26-1(b), a statement of the reasons why longer or different  
17 time periods should apply to the case...” Here, the parties have not complied with LR 26-1(a).

18 Accordingly,

19 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that proposed Joint Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order (ECF No.  
20 11) is DENIED without prejudice.

21 DATED this 22nd day of March, 2018.

22 

23 CAM FERENBACH  
24 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
25